

## **EXHIBIT 14**

**From:** Hamish Tonkin/EUZ/ChubbMail  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 12, 2016 5:14 AM  
**To:** Russell Hodey <rhodey@chubb.com>; Ghislanzoni, Claudio <Claudio.Ghislanzoni@Chubb.com>  
**Cc:** Pullinger, Ben - Sydney <Ben.Pullinger@Chubb.com>; Dan Tedeschi/EUZ/ChubbMail; Rowlands, David <David.Rowlands@Chubb.com>; Emily A Gillett <egillett@chubb.com>; Martin.Sill@dws.com.au  
**Subject:** RE: Changing Rules Engine Software  
**Attach:** Rules Engine matrix.xlsx

---

Hi Russ,

Please see attached the criteria for determining the type of rules engine. I am in favour of proposing coding the Evolution rules in Java (with a few caveats) – so long as we adhere as much as possible the criteria in the attached spreadsheet. Please can you let me know if there are any exceptions.

I agree, the majority of the business rules you sent through are quite simple and atomic. Some commentary and guidelines tho (also in tab "rules standards"), I would try and make the rules as linear as possible with single operands, rather than combining them as per some of the rules (Blaze is fine for multiple operands and parent/child/chaining/rete etc) as we don't want to develop this sort of functionality into something we are building from scratch. When we start nesting decisions and getting more complex rule algorithms is where we edge over to Option 2 and 3. So advice is to split the rules (that have multiple operands or chaining/rete/etc) into new discrete rules.

Let's wait and see what Martin comes up with in terms of analysis, before we go down investigating Drools any further.

Catch up on Monday. In meantime, any questions please shout.

Cheers

Hamish

**From:** rhodey@chubb.com [mailto:rhodey@chubb.com]  
**Sent:** 12 May, 2016 00:55  
**To:** Ghislanzoni, Claudio  
**Cc:** Pullinger, Ben - Sydney; Tedeschi, Dan; Rowlands, David; Gillett, Emily A; Tonkin, Hamish; Martin.Sill@dws.com.au  
**Subject:** Changing Rules Engine Software



Gents,  
 Thanks for everyone's time yesterday, we really appreciate the support. Attached are the rules for New Business & renewals, which I'm sure you'll agree are pretty straight forward.

Hamish - didn't get your matrix, can you send over please

Having discussed this further with Martin, the solution architect at DWS, here is our proposal (it does differ from what we agreed last night but I believe helps us to make a more informed decision, once the research is complete) -

1. DWS will continue to explore Drools as they believe this java library will significantly reduce the effort of the re-engineering effort (ie. rough estimate possibly in half)
2. This will be concluded by Friday (tmw for us). DWS will keep Ben in the loop with this research

Confidential

U.S. DIST COURT – MN  
 PLAINTIFF EXHIBIT

**P-0526**

Case No. 16-cv-1054-DTS

FED013893\_0001

3. We all reconvene on Monday (night AUS time), along with Martin to determine -

- a. That a tactical solution is suitable, or not
- b. What that tactical solution is - native java, or Drools

Can someone help highlight the questions that need to be addressed on Drools so we can get these looked into also.

REDACTED

REDACTED

Good or bad, timing, depending on your view point!

Afraid I am off tmw and travelling so will re-connect on Monday. In the meantime Martin will be happy to work with Ben on any detailed questions etc

Speak Monday

**Russell Hodey**

Head of Strategic Delivery, APAC IT

Chubb Insurance Company of Australia Limited  
Citigroup Centre, Level 29/2 Park Street, Sydney, Australia

O +61 2 9273 0468 M +61 427907547

E [rhodey@chubb.com](mailto:rhodey@chubb.com)

W [www.chubbinsurance.com.au](http://www.chubbinsurance.com.au) | [www.new.chubb.com](http://www.new.chubb.com)

ACE and Chubb are now one.

----- Forwarded by Russell Hodey/INTL/ChubbMail on 12/05/2016 09:50 AM -----

From: Martin Sill <[Martin.Sill@dws.com.au](mailto:Martin.Sill@dws.com.au)>  
To: "[rhodey@chubb.com](mailto:rhodey@chubb.com)" <[rhodey@chubb.com](mailto:rhodey@chubb.com)>  
Date: 12/05/2016 09:12 AM  
Subject: Referral rules specifications

Hi Russ,

Attached are the New Business and Renewal referral rules specifications.

As you'll see, the conditions tested are quite straightforward, and there is very little, if any branching or conditionality of the type: If Condition A, Test Condition B, else do Condition C.

I'll pull together some brief notes on how rules are implemented in Blaze currently - it's very straightforward.

Cheers,  
Martin

Martin Sill  
Project Manager  
M: 0447 442 175 P: 02 9448 7311  
A: Level 8, 146 Arthur St, North Sydney, NSW 2060  
E: [martin.sill@dws.com.au](mailto:martin.sill@dws.com.au) W: [www.dws.com.au](http://www.dws.com.au)

Confidential

FED013893\_0002

P-0526-002

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and are only for the use of the person to whom they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient you have received this email in error and are requested to delete it immediately. Any opinion expressed in this email may not necessarily be that of DWS Ltd.

*Please consider the environment before printing this email.(See attached file: Australia PLD New Business Referral Rules v1.6.xls)(See attached file: Australia PLD Renewal Referral Rules v2.0.xls)*